



SCHOOL of  
GRADUATE STUDIES

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University  
**Digital Commons @ East  
Tennessee State University**

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

---

5-2006

# War on the Media: The News Framing of the Iraqi War in the United States, Europe, and Latin America.

Maria Pestalardo

*East Tennessee State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Pestalardo, Maria, "War on the Media: The News Framing of the Iraqi War in the United States, Europe, and Latin America." (2006). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2205. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2205>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact [digilib@etsu.edu](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

War on the Media: The News Framing of the Iraqi War in the United States, Europe, and Latin  
America

---

A thesis  
presented to  
the faculty of the Department of Communication  
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment  
of the requirement for the degree  
Master of Arts in Professional Communication

---

by  
María Pestalardo  
May 2006

---

Dr. King, John, Chair  
Dr. Mooney, Jack  
Dr. Mijeski, Kenneth

Keywords: News framing, Iraq, war coverage, media, journalism, international framing,  
embedded journalists

## ABSTRACT

War on the Media: The News Framing of the Iraqi War in the United States, Europe, and Latin America

by

María Pestalardo

This study analyzes the framing of the war in Iraq (2003) during the week before and the week after the conflict started according to the media coverage of nine leading newspapers from United States, Europe, and Latin America.

Through quantitative content analysis, the researcher answered seven research questions and analyzed the framing, sources, and approaches used by the newspapers in the news coverage of the conflict. The researcher compared the news coverage of each region and found that there were significant differences in the content of the war reporting according to the geographical area of the media. European and Latin American newspapers framed a “bigger and more balanced picture” in covering more sides of the war and quoting diverse sources while American media covered a narrower range of war perspectives and quoted coalition sources in almost all of their news stories and editorials.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am profoundly thankful to Dr. King, my Committee Chair, for his help and guidance thorough this study. I am also grateful to Dr. Mooney and Dr. Mijeski for their help and interests in this study. Many thanks to Honey Comer, the secondary coder, for her help and support to this study, since she made this project possible. Thank you to all my teachers, who supported, helped, and encouraged me through my graduate career.

## CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	3
LIST OF TABLES.....	5
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
Historical Context of the war.....	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Framing News.....	9
Framing Process and Cascade Mode.....	12
International Framing.....	13
War Times and the Media.....	15
Media Coverage of the War in Iraq and Afghanistan .....	18
3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	26
4. METHODOLOGY.....	27
5. RESULTS.....	29
Newspaper by source.....	29
Newspaper by News Framing.....	32
Newspaper by Approach.....	34
Region by Sources.....	36
Region by News Framing.....	37
Region by Approach.....	38
Editorials vs. News Stories.....	39
6. CONCLUSION .....	44
Discussion: Sources Used .....	44
Discussion: News Framing Used .....	46
Discussion3: Approach Used .....	48
Limitations.....	50
Covering the War in Iraq .....	51
NOTES .....	54
REFERENCES.....	55
APPENDICES.....	58
Appendix A - Codebook.....	58
Appendix B - Main Tables in Percentages.....	64
VITA.....	75

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Newspaper by Source.....	30
2. Newspaper by News Framing.....	33
3. Newspaper by Approach.....	35
4. Region by Source.....	37
5. Region by News Framing.....	38
6. Region by Approach.....	39
7. Written Piece by Source.....	40
8. Written Piece by News Framing.....	42
9. Written Piece by Approach.....	43
10. Newspaper by Source.....	65
11. Newspaper by News Frame.....	67
12. Region by Source.....	69
13. Region by News Frame.....	70
14. Written Piece by Source.....	71
15. Written Piece by News Frame.....	73

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Through this study, the researcher exposed how the media coverage of the Iraq conflict differed according to the country where it was published.

This specific war has brought new challenges for different disciplines: politics, military, diplomacy, international politics, and media, among others. It involved a controversial political dispute among countries and regions; it confronted the United States with international and national public opinions and political systems. Antiwar protests multiplied around the world and political leaders were losing their countries' approval if they supported the United States. United Nations lost authority and its strength was questioned after the confrontation with the Bush Administration and the UN Security Council, which did not allow the United States to invade Iraq under legal terms or international laws.

War is a complex thing and involves different realities from different perspectives. This war was unique and brought all kind of challenges for Americans and the rest of the globe when a new world order was installed since an important anti-Americanism feeling grew among different countries and regions. The news coverage of this conflict in each region transmitted different perspectives of the same crisis and framed the Iraqi war under different standards.

Media played a very important role during this war given that media were one of the most important propaganda strategies of the Bush Administration and its allies. At the beginning of the war, American media, favored by its technological advances, created positive outputs to the coalition of the Willing's interests.

This study analyzes and compares the news coverage of the Iraq conflict among three different geographical areas. The researcher analyzed the news coverage of nine newspapers during one week before and one week after the war started. The newspapers were: *The London*

*Times* from England, *The Moscow Times* from Russia, *The International Herald Tribune* from France, *El Universal* from Mexico, *El Universal* from Venezuela, *La Nación* from Argentina, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The San Francisco Chronicle* from United States.

Through quantitative content analysis, the researcher answered seven research questions and analyzed the framing, sources and approaches used by the newspapers in the news coverage of the conflict. Two coders analyzed 600 news stories composed by 7,178 paragraphs, which were the unit of analysis of this study.

### Historical Context of the War

On September 11, 2001, nineteen Muslim men hijacked four U.S. commercial passenger planes and used them to attack the World Trade center towers in New York City, the Pentagon in Washington DC, and another target in Pennsylvania. In the days that followed this disaster, President George W. Bush declared war on terrorists such as the hijackers and on any and all nations that harbor such terrorists.

In the fall of 2002, the Bush administration began developing plans to forcibly remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. The purpose was to rid that country of the dictatorship of the Iraqi president Saddam Hussein. Bush also charged that Saddam Hussein had, or was developing, weapons of mass destruction that he could unleash, or threaten to unleash, on the rest of the world. The U.S. government would partially justify this preemptive action based on a United Nations Security Council resolution requiring Saddam to fully disarm, although Bush undertook this specific action without United Nations authority. He did cite congressional approval, given following the September 11 attacks (9/11), to protect the United States from terrorists.



On the evening of March 17, 2003, in a televised address to the nation, Bush gave Saddam Hussein forty-eight hours to leave Iraq or be removed by force. Saddam did not leave. By then, most of the journalists also were in position in Kuwait or were in the process of embedding with their assigned troops.

On March 20, 2003, Baghdad time, the United States, in coalition with its allies (Great Britain in particular) officially began waging war with Iraq by dropping a dawn hail of missiles and bombs on Baghdad, the Iraqi capital, where Saddam was believed to be at that moment. At the same time, thousands of coalition ground forces began moving into Iraq, coming in from Kuwait. Nearly six hundred embedded journalists were advancing with these troops.

This war was the most media-covered war in recent times. More than 3,000 journalists were assigned to the region; almost 600 of these were embedded with various military units and the others were scattered over the area, working for news organizations.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The analysis of media coverage of the war in Iraq (2003) includes several factors, such as framing news, framing process and cascade model, international framing, war times and the media, media coverage of the war in Iraq, embedded journalism, Bush Administration framing, and the agenda setting model.

#### Framing News

Framing occurs when, in the course of describing an issue or event the media's emphasis on the subset of potentially relevant considerations causes individuals to focus on these considerations when constructing their opinion instead of on others. Fuyuan Shen (2004) says that media frames can have significant consequences on how audiences perceive and understand issues and can alter public opinions on ambivalent and controversial issues. In doing so, the news media can increase the relevance and newsworthiness of issues or events to the audiences.

Among studies about media framing, Adam Simon (2001) provides a common definition for framing. He based his study on the definition of framing: "the process by which a source defines the essential problem underlying a particular social or political issue and outlines a set of considerations purportedly relevant to that issue." According to Simon, in order to fully understand how framing works, it is important to know how human memory works. Memory associates concepts to create ideas. Therefore, choosing the right concepts in a story can evoke the right idea by association of those concepts. The framing process is an internal process for each individual, not in relation of the unit of information and its context.

Matthew Nisbt, Dominique Brossard, and Adrianna Kroepsch (2003) analyzed framing and the role of journalists in constructing drama stories. They support the idea that media, as a business

enterprise, tries to sell stories, and those ones that reflect human drama sell the most. So, war times are among of the most profitable times for media business. In this process, the media agenda-setting and the media frame-building process frame the news according to the central organization of an idea or story line, providing meaning to an unfolding of a series of events. Certain types of interests, including governmental sources, are likely to be more influential in setting the agenda and framing issues than others are (and the most prominent frames include strategy/conflict situations, which is the narrative context of wars). But this influence in the media agenda-building and frame-building process is attenuated in part by the preferences of journalists for dramatic news narratives and for the intervention of the journalist in the same place that news occurs.

On the other hand, Jack Lule (2003) analyzed the metaphors used in the coverage of the war in Iraq, such as the timetable, the games of Saddam, the patience of the White House, and making the case/selling the plan. According to Lule, metaphors frame the news and are used by media and politicians in the conception and construction of war. During the Iraq war, media adopted the metaphors used by the Bush Administration and even extended such language. These metaphors provided a means to understand how the prelude to war was framed and portrayed by news media that anticipated rather than debated the prospect of war. He charged the American media with failing in its duty to provide debate, history, context, and reporting on the decision to go to war with Iraq.

Michael Ryan (2004) analyzed editorials from United States' ten largest newspapers<sup>1</sup> during the war against terrorism in 2001 (from September, 12 to October, 8) and concluded that media did not explore, analyze, evaluate, and publicize alternative strategies and ideas since they followed the Bush's Administration framing of the war. President Bush successfully framed the world as polar opposites and for the most part, newspapers transmitted it through their editorials.

According to Ryan, the editorials did not reflect alternative points of view or the opposing side of the critical issues, and during times of terrible crisis, opinion pages may not serve readers best. For example, the 10 newspapers said little about potential civilian casualties until after President Bush stressed the point in the second period of the war. Similarly, humanitarian aid and the definition of “enemy” (i.e. the enemy is not Muslims or the Afghan people) were not part of the editorial writers’ frames in the first period. All these issues were stressed after President Bush began to emphasize the point.

Frames define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies. According to Ryan, the media and government frames created following the September 11 attacks did these things but in remarkably narrow ways. The problem was that United States (not the world) was attacked; that the cause was evil, misguided, and religious zealots; the moral judgment was that the zealots were immoral and Americans were righteous; and that military strikes were the remedy. The world was viewed in binary terms (Americans were seen as innocent and “good,” and Arabs like terrorists and “bad” people) and the Bush Administration (with the help of many world leaders) was framing its own narrative, and that narrative was virtually identical to that of the editorial writers.

Ray Eldon Hiebert (2003) analyzes how the Bush administration frames the war in Iraq through public relations and propaganda strategies. In this study, he discusses framing, propaganda, media, and public opinion. He says that the biggest and most important public relations innovation of the Iraq War was the embedding of about 600 journalists with the troops doing the actual fighting. Clark S. Judge, managing director of the White House Writers Group, says embedding “...counts as the first major victory in the war in Iraq.”

### Framing Process and Cascade Model

Another important factor in the communication process of writing a news story is the cascade effects of the information, which runs from the government to the general public, passing through leaders and media. Robert Entman (2003) analyzes the cascade model of the 9/11 attacks when the Bush administration framed the attacks and it reinforced this strategy through all the lines of communication, reaching leaders, the media, and through the general public. According to Entman, when the Bush Administration promoted “war” against terrorism, the media were not entirely passive receptacles for this government propaganda. The author uses the cascade model to illuminate deviation from the preferred frame by the media. In his cascade model, he presents a line of influences: government influences elites, which influences media, which in turn shape public opinion through the framing of words and images. Journalists do go through some strategic thinking in deciding how to frame their stories. They seek to produce “good stories” that protect and advance their careers and that accord with their self-images as independent watchdogs who must provide a degree of balance to stories. The most inherently powerful frames are those fully congruent with schemas habitually used by the most members of society. In conveying an unambiguous and emotionally compelling frame to the public, reminding of the “evil,” it helped to maintain their support. In contrast to Adam Simon’s idea of framing, he declares that framing entails selecting and highlighting some facet of events or issues and making connections among them in order to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation, and/or solution. According to Entman, words and images stimulate support of or opposition to the sides in a political conflict. He measures this capacity by cultural resonance and magnitude. Those frames that imply more culturally resonant terms have the greatest potential for influence. Journalists use words and images highly salient in the culture, which is to say noticeable, understandable, memorable, and

emotionally charged. Magnitude taps the prominence and repetition of the framing words and images. The more resonance and magnitude, the more likely the framing is to evoke similar thoughts and feelings in large proportions of the audience. In recurring use of words such as evil and war in framing September 11, he says that the Bush Administration was leading the public to war in advance.

### International Framing

As the Iraq war involved more than one country and international and national public opinion(s), for the American government, it was vital to shape the perception about other countries and leaders in order to gain support for United States' causes. Different professionals analyzed how media shape the perception of foreign countries through the framing process.

Through an experimental study, Paul Brewer, Joseph Graf, and Lars Willnat (2003) examined how media affect the standards by which people evaluate foreign countries. They used three experimental groups and one control group and they pre- and posttested their attitude toward foreign nations. They gave these four groups two different questionnaires, one about drugs and terrorism and another about their attitude towards some nations. After these questionnaires, they gave to the experimental groups some fake news about the relation of those countries to drugs and terrorism and they provided to the control group news about computers and the Euro. When they applied the posttest, those groups that read the first news negatively changed their attitudes towards those countries, but the control group did not show any change in their attitudes towards these nations.

The framing process is very important in their analysis because the researchers say that news stories present a frame linking an issue to a foreign nation in a way that suggests a particular

implication shaping how audience members judge that nation. They use the same model that Simon uses about the implication of the memory in the process of framing. According to them, memory consists of an organized network of concepts (or nodes) that are linked through associative pathways and news stories may indirectly influence such judgments. Once one node is activated, activation spreads along the associative pathways to other nodes in the mental network. According to this view, a concept's accessibility within memory is determined in part by the frequency and recency with which it has been used in the past. People typically rely on the mass media for information about political events, and the exposure to media coverage of an issue tends to make that issue more accessible in the people's minds. This heightened accessibility, in turn, increases the likelihood that people will base subsequent evaluations on their thoughts about the issue. The route by which the media influence attitudes toward foreign countries is through framing; and it works through an accessibility-driven process. It influences the accessibility of associations in memory.

Ilija Tomanic Trivundza (2004) analyzes how media shape our knowledge of the world. According to her, media exert a great influence on where public attention is focused and how much importance is attributed to a certain topic. Journalists often resort to frames in order to set particular events within their broader context through their stories and pictures, as a visual proof of events. She indicates that in the international media coverage of the Iraq war, the ideological framing depends primarily on culturally specific patterns of self-identification with the nations or cultures involved in the conflict. According to her, media frame nations based on antagonism (the good-the bad, the inferior-the superior, etc). Orientalism is a pertinent frame for representing race, nationality, and otherness in media and is established on the basis of contrast to others, serving as articulation of differences. According to her, in order to protect *Western civilization and its way of*

life and to gain a stronger moral justification for the invasion of Iraq, the western media established the image of Saddam Hussein as the incarnation of an evil, dangerous madman and the new Hitler. American media published pictures of U.S. soldiers in accessible, familiar mode, talking to groups of Iraqis, securing law and order. In Slovenia and Germany, media published pictures of U.S. soldiers capturing or destroying symbolic markers of the Iraqi regime or the damage caused to civilian objects by the massive bombings.

### War Times and the Media

It is essential for this research to compare the coverage of the war in Iraq with studies from other wars and to draw conclusions based on the existence of similar patterns or significant differences in the reporting.

Lards Nord and Jesper Stromback (2003) analyzed the role of professional journalism during war times. On one hand, they stress that war reporting relies on political and military resources, whose incentives are often to cover up the truth and manipulate media reporting. Political propaganda is intrinsic in times of war and presents a challenge for every media organization to criticize the sources, balance news selection, and maintain its editorial independence. However, according to the researchers, there are some factors that influence the media coverage of a war. First, if the country of the journalist is involved in the war and, second, if there are political or/and international disagreements about that conflict. The pressure for news, affected by the growing competition for people's attention, has created a challenge for the covering of the war in Iraq and the objective and balanced reporting of it. According to them, the noble art of war reporting could be described as a "mission impossible" since there is no time to prepare for a forthcoming event or a chance to learn on existing journalistic routines. In their analysis of the



war in Iraq, they said that the international media were very dependent on American news media and their reporting resulted in biased stories, which ultimately favored the American side of the conflict.

Michael Pfau, Michel Haigh, Mitchell Gettle, Michael Donnelly, Gregory Scoot, Dana Warr, and Elaine Wittenberg (2004) analyzed the coverage of the war in Iraq by journalists who are reporting from military combat units of Operation “Iraqi Freedom” (2003) in contrast to the journalists’ role in the conflicts “Enduring Freedom”(2001) and “Desert Storm” (1991).

According to the researchers, as journalists depend on the soldiers they are covering for their own survival, they lose objectivity or perspective in their reports, which were more decontextualized in form and more favorable in tone. After analyzing the three conflicts’ media coverage, they concluded that during the “Iraqi Freedom” mission, embedded journalists’ stories about the military, its units, and personnel were more episodic in nature than the nonembedded journalists’ coverage of the same conflict. They distinguish between episodic and thematic frames. Episodic framing seeks to personalize issues, whereas thematic framing presents collective or general evidence about issues. This study argues that the nature of embedding reporters in combat units in war is a special circumstance that should produce episodic framing of news stories because reporters are attached to specific units for extended periods, literally isolated from the broader war.

They also concluded that embedded coverage of Operation “Iraqi Freedom” was more favorable in tone, both toward the military generally and toward its personnel, than during the other two military conflicts. Because of that, this war’s coverage can be more positively biased toward the military than coverage of “Desert Storm” and “Enduring Freedom.” According to the researchers, for the military, embedded news is a strategy to counterbalance the enemy misinformation, to reach the consumers with the effectiveness of American fighting forces, and to

provide a positive spin to news coverage. However, for the journalism establishment, embedding embodies a professionally treacherous reef. Since it covers combat operation closely in the process, it loses perspective and, thus, sacrifices the idealized standard of reporter objectivity. A good alternative may be using reports from the embedded soldiers and other broader analysis of the war.

In their book *Media at war* (2004), Howard Tumber and Jerry Palmer described the difference between embedded journalists and the “unilaterals.” Unilateral is the Pentagon’s bureaucratic term for the “...distrusted rabble of independent minded journalists” in Kuwait, those who are unable or unwilling to “embed” with American military units. In their book they quoted Geoffrey York of the *Canadian Globe and Mail*, who was part of the unilaterals who said that they were ‘outsiders, powerless and marginal, lacking any propaganda value in Washington’s media strategy.’ According to York, it was almost impossible for an unilateral even to obtain a face-to-face meeting with a U.S. military spokesman and that for correspondents who preferred to be independent and mobile it was a humiliating situation. He explained that during the post-invasion period, the U.S. forces took small groups of unilaterals by bus or helicopter from Kuwait to carefully chosen ‘liberated’ sites in Iraq where the battlefield would have been tidied up, the collateral damage would have been removed, and cheering crowds of pro-American civilians would presumably be provided. York believed that in the end he and his colleagues may have been glad of this outsider status in contrast to the embedded journalists who would only have seen a war from a narrow military viewpoint.

*Parameters*, the U.S. Army War College Quarterly, published in 2005 a study of the media as an instrument of war by Kenneth Payne. He analyzed how American Army controlled the dissemination of information so as to maximize the military and political advantage to US forces.

The current U.S. Army field manual goes on to describe the mechanism through which an enemy can be deceived through the construction of "...a plausible, but false, view of the situation, which will lead the deception target into acting in a manner that will accomplish the commander's goal. Once the story is completed, the Deception Working Group determines the deception means necessary to portray the events and indicators."<sup>2</sup> According to Payne, whether for purposes of military deception or more broadly in an effort to control the public perception of a conflict, the U.S. military has been interested in influencing how the media perceive the events on the battlefield. During the Iraq invasion, the two main methods by which the U.S. military sought to influence the media were the program of embedding reporters and the strategic-level news presentations given by senior personnel in Qatar and Washington, who control the "big picture" of information through daily briefings. In doing so, U.S. military enjoys a high degree of control over which part of the battlefield will receive media coverage.

### Media Coverage of the War in Iraq and Afghanistan

In Israel, Tamar Liebes (1992) compared the coverage of the Gulf War and the War in Israel by American and Israeli media. In this study, he analyzed how the media cover war differently depending on who is involved. When the journalists' own country is at war, they will frame the news as "our" war, and when the journalists report a conflict among nations that does not involve their own country, they will frame that as "their" war. Journalists have to deal with their patriotic fervor and their instinctive loyalty to their own country and their professional duty of morale building that presides over their careers. After two years of analysis of American and Israeli television channels, he concluded that in "our" war coverage, television journalists tended to excise the opposite side, sanitize the suffering inflicted on it, attribute equal strength to both

sides, personalize “our” side, demonize “their” side, and decontextualize the aggressive actions of the conflict. Ideology of objectivity, neutrality, and balance is reserved for reporting other people’s troubles, rather than one’s own.

Wilhelm Haumann and Thomas Petersen (2004) studied German public opinion towards the U.S. position in the war in Afghanistan. In order to analyze the coverage of the war by media, these authors used the Spiral of Silence and the Media Framing theories. The United States and Germany framed the news of the war in Afghanistan differently, while the media from United States were concentrated on actions of the governments involved in the conflict and news from the battlefield, the German media focused on the civilian population in Afghanistan.

Another study deeply analyzed the significant differences in media reporting in the United States and Germany during the Iraq War and it was done by Ingrid Lehmann (2005) during the seven months prior to the war. The researcher suggests that absence of critical reporting in both countries allowed the respective governments to dominate the foreign policy agenda. This led American public opinion to support the war and German public opinion to abstain.

According to Lehman, during time of crisis, journalists are often too dependent on official sources and locate themselves too closely to the governmental centers of power. In the study, it was argued that during times of executive predominance over a certain issue, such as occurred in the prewar period studied in this research, critical reporting would fall outside the dominant frames. Also Lehman said that journalists, as well as citizens, are less likely to criticize their governmental leadership during times of perceived threats to national security. This study of prewar reporting suggests that in times of crisis, media are indeed culture-bound and are less likely to voice opposing views than in times of noncrisis.

Lehman states that one of the differences between United States and Germany is that Europeans did not change their sense of security, even after the terrorist attacks on European soil, as the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon did in United States. Americans were outraged by the terrorist assaults, and they overwhelmingly supported the president's response. Another factor that has also been taken into account is the different political culture in both countries. The German public remains in a post-1945 mode, which is characterized by an aversion to war.

Through an analysis of the two major newspapers (*The New York Times* and the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* or *FAZ*) and broadcast shows (*NBC Nightly News* and *Die Tagesschau*), Lehman compared the coverage of the war by both nations. The study demonstrated that both newspapers revealed a similarity in tone and in content. Even though *The New York Times* was generally more critical of the inspections of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) than the *FAZ*, that did little to discredit or undermine the inspections process. In television reporting, *NBC Nightly News* was more biased toward the U.S. position than the German TV, which attempted to maintain a balance in its reporting by including Iraqi sources and regularly reporting on Iraqi and international perspectives. There was also a difference in the sheer volume of reporting. The German media reported less about the Iraq situation than did their American counterparts.

On one of her analyses the researcher showed that on January 27, *NBC Nightly News* was broadcasting under the screen title "Road to War." During this day, there was a story in which U.S. officials expressed their conviction "that a terrorist camp in Iraq is a deadly weapons factory" for ricin and cyanide, which "is operated by Ansar al-Islam, a terrorist group with known ties to al Qaeda." On January 28, *NBC* reported that Iraq was preventing inspectors from interviewing

scientists in private. During these last prewar days, personal attacks against the UN inspectors became more frequent by that American TV network.

An editorial in the *FAZ* on the same day concluded also that the combination of threats, inspections, and sanctions against Iraq was “the lesser evil.” The *FAZ* also carried two articles giving the Iraqi perspective on inspections. German TV *Die Tagesschau* on January 27 gave extensive coverage to Hans Blix’s (the chief inspector for chemical and biological weapons) report, and it covered the U.S. reaction, the French position, Kofi Annan’s comments, and U.K. Ambassador Sir Jeremy Greenstock agreeing with Germany on giving inspectors time to report again in mid-February. *Die Tagesschau* also interviewed Iraq’s Sabri, who charged that the United States only wanted to secure the region’s oil resources. Schroeder was quoted as reiterating his position that a military attack was not justified, and opposition leader Merkel was portrayed criticizing Schroeder for taking a position before the UN report had been published.

According to Lehman, the consistent use of commentators and perspective from other countries and international organizations on German television probably helped to maintain a more balanced spectrum of views. During the period under review, the United States related to international affairs in a crisis mode, fighting the “war against terror” as a consequence of the attacks on 9/11. According to the study, although the alleged links between the perpetrators and Saddam Hussein’s regime were not proven, the U.S. public continued in 2002 and 2003 to make such connections in “surprisingly” large numbers.

As said by the researcher, for most parts, American journalists uncritically accepted the slogans of the Bush Administration, such as “Saddam, the tyrant and madman,” linking Saddam Hussein to al-Qaeda and the 9/11 terrorist attack, and arguing that Iraq’s alleged weapons of mass destruction posed a direct threat to the United States.

According to Lehman, in the period between the 9/11 attacks and the war against Iraq, the American media have largely relinquished their watchdog function, a critical function for democratic societies that must be restored.

Another study that compares European and American coverage of the war was done by Justin Lewis (2004). Through a content analysis and a qualitative analysis of British coverage of the war, Lewis analyzed the relationship between the television coverage of the Iraq War and changes in British public opinion towards the war. In Britain, public opinion (in forms of polls and huge demonstrations) appeared to be against U.S. policy to invade Iraq before the war began but seemed to swing behind it once the conflict started.

A majority was opposed to the war before and a few months after, but a majority was in favor during the war itself. Opinion polls suggested that 49 percent of the switchers said that they changed their minds because they wanted to support the troops during the war. As stated by Lewis, this distinction between supporting the troops and supporting the policy was generally ignored by media coverage. She assumed that the desire to be seen to “support our troops” may have been compounded by the fear of being seen as part of an isolated, unpatriotic minority.

However, the researcher’s data also suggest that the shift to a pro-war position in the polls cannot be accounted for purely by the desire to “support the troops.” Part of the reason for shifting was a change in the media climate. The large network of embedded reporters changed the way the war was reported and was a Pentagon program to control the “big picture.”

Lewis’ content analysis found that, on British television, most of the reports from the region came from embeds. On the other hand, once the war started the British news media tended to reproduce, rather than question, claims about weapons of mass destruction. According to her data, British broadcasters were eight times more likely to make references indicating the presence

of chemical and biological weapons than to suggest their absence. More significant was the discourse of “liberation.” Ordinary Iraqis were at the center of debate about the war but broadcasters covered a war against a rarely seen enemy: if Iraqi civilians were enigmatic, the Iraqi soldiers were almost invisible- rarely seen or discussed, but generally assumed to be supportive of Saddam Hussein. Also, according to Lewis, there was too little coverage of the Iraqi people’s reaction to war.

On the other hand, the researcher argued that public support for military action was partly aided by the nature of the media’s war coverage, by the ways in which the media produced certain pro-war assumptions, and by the exclusion of more critical forms of coverage. The reason why television coverage helped create a pro-war climate was not the result of forms of bias but the product of news values that privileged certain assumptions. From the pro-war perspective, the absence of embeds with Iraqi forces and the norms of taste and decency made it difficult for broadcasters to show the more graphic images of death and destruction or the ugly side of war, creating a stream of footage that humanized the U.S.-led forces and dehumanized the Iraqis. This also gave the narrative an almost fictional quality, since this kind of reporting makes it too easy to forget people are dying. The embeds became the lens through which allies could be seen winning the war. On the other hand, the assumptions that Saddam Hussein had connections to the September 11 attacks or to al Qaeda were directly linked to support for the war in Iraq. According to Lewis, since September 11, 2001, world leaders know that they can engage public opinion through discourses about terrorism, because it is highly newsworthy and a key of public concern. So, the informational context in which British people responded to surveys was important because it made it easier to support the war and more difficult to summon up arguments against it. Questions about the motives, efficacy, and legality of the war (questions that might have created



doubt in people's minds) were suspended.

According to Lewis, the problems of post-war, together with the failure to find weapons of mass destruction (giving credence to reports suggesting the government exaggerated the threat posed by Saddam Hussein) meant that, by the end of the summer, support for the war dropped to pre-war levels. The researcher concluded that in Britain, at least, the media framing was not a product of any decision by broadcasters to abandon impartiality, but a consequence of routine decisions about news values and practices.

Daniela V. Dimitrova and Lynda Lee Kaid (2005), studied 246 international Web sites that covered the immediate news framing of Gulf War II. They found that domestic news sites focused more heavily on the military conflict, human interest, and media self-coverage, while the responsibility frame was more common for international sites. Also, online news coverage in countries officially supporting the war was more positive than in the countries opposing the war. According to the researchers, the media are part of a broader national system and can be influenced by the political, economical, and social constraints of the broader systems in which they exist. They argued that global media still must remain culturally specific orientations in their coverage in order to reach local audiences, so they reflect, express, and sometimes actively serve the "national interests," as determined by other, more powerful actors and institutions. This phenomenon is referred to as "domestication" of news: translating the news for the local audience and framing it in ways targeted to the given culture. In contrast to international media, the researchers found that there was lack of discussion of responsibility issues across U.S. Web publications and that American media did a poor job of explaining the Iraq War to the American public, leading to sustained misperceptions of the event. For example, according to the researchers, a large portion of the U.S. population believed that weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq, that Saddam

Hussein had significant ties with al-Qaeda, and that world opinion was mostly in support of the war.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions of this study were:

RQ1: *Which sources were used by each newspaper one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

RQ2: *Which frames were used by each newspaper one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

RQ3: *Which approaches were used by each newspaper one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

RQ4: *Which sources were used by region one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

RQ5: *Which frames were used by each region one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

RQ6: *Which approaches were used by each region one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

RQ7: *Which sources, news frames and approaches were the most used in editorials and news stories one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

## CHAPTER 4

### METHODOLOGY

Through quantitative content analysis the researcher examined the research questions. She studied the coverage of the war in Iraq by nine newspapers during one week after and one week before the war started (from March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2003 to March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2003).

The sample of the newspapers was a purposive sample because it was based on: national reputation of the news publications, importance of the media's country on their region during the Iraq conflict, and the online availability.

To maintain a 0.04 level of probability, the researcher built a sample of 600 stories out of 4,400 from the total sample. To represent each newspaper's coverage, the researcher maintained the same percentage of news stories per newspaper according to the percentages of news stories presented in the sample by each newspaper. Maintaining these quantities, the researcher selected the articles to be used for each newspaper through a research randomizer table (<http://www.randomizer.org/form.htm>).

The sample news stories were downloaded from the Lexis-Nexis database and the archives on the Web sites of some of the newspapers. All the stories that contained the word 'Iraq' and were applicable to this study were selected and out of that final list, the researcher applied each list of numbers provided by the research randomizer table to select the news stories of each newspaper that would be included in this study.

In order to analyze the news coverage, the unit of analysis was each paragraph of the selected stories. The coders analyzed a total of 7,178 paragraphs.

The independent variables were the newspaper's name and region and the date of the publication. The dependent variables were the source, framing, and approach of each paragraph

and the kind of written piece represented by each article.

The source variable had 35 categories, the framing variable had 31 categories (see codebook in appendix A). The written piece variable had two (editorials or news stories). The approach variable had four categories (favorable, unfavorable, balanced, and factual). A paragraph was coded as favorable if it reflected positively the U.S. position in the Iraq war; highlighted the U.S. military or the coalition of the Willing<sup>1</sup> talents or accomplishments in the war; associated the U.S. or its coalition with positive characteristics or actions; or honored their culture or people. A paragraph was coded as unfavorable if it reflected negatively on the U.S. position in the Iraq war; associated the U.S. or the coalition of the Willing with unethical, illegal, or immoral behavior; suggested the U.S or any of its coalition's countries was a source of problem; or associated them with a negative experience of failure. A paragraph was coded as balanced if the story was positive and negative toward the U.S. position in the Iraq war, because it provided nearly equal amounts of positive and negative information. This neutral or mixed tone category was also included to capture coverage that was neither supportive of the war nor opposing the war. A paragraph was coded as factual if the news information did not clearly take a favorable, unfavorable, or balanced position toward the U.S. position in the war.

In this study, the probability level was stated  $< 0.001$  and the confidence level was 96 percent. An inter-coder reliability test was conducted prior to the study in order to ensure agreement between coders. After coding, 100 percent reliability was achieved on the 'newspaper,' 'date,' 'article number,' 'written piece,' 'number of paragraph,' 'source,' and 'approach' variables. The reliability for the 'frame' variable was 96 percent.

Coder 1 analyzed three newspapers (290 stories or 2,767 paragraphs) and coder 2 analyzed 6 newspapers (310 stories or 4,411 paragraphs).

## CHAPTER 5

### RESULTS

#### “Newspaper by Source”

RQ1: *Which sources were used by each newspaper one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since the Phi value was  $< 0.001$  (Table 1)

In United States, “journalist” was the most used source in the three newspapers before the war started. Among the three most used sources, “American government officials” and “coalition soldiers” were quoted in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, and “embedded reporters” and “general public” in *The San Francisco Chronicle*.

After the war started, “journalist” and “American government officials” were among the three most used sources in the three American newspapers. “General public” was used in *The New York Times* and *The San Francisco Chronicle* and “Coalition soldiers” in *The Washington Post*. *The San Francisco Chronicle* quoted as well “country experts, opinion leaders and professors.”

In Europe, “journalists” was the most used source in the three newspapers before the war started. “Country experts, opinion leaders and professors” were quoted in *The London Times* and *The Moscow Times* among the three most used sources. “UK government officials” were quoted in *The London Times*, “Russian government officials” in *The Moscow Times* and “American government officials” and “coalition soldiers” in *The International Herald Tribune*.

After the war started, “journalists” was the most used source in the three newspapers. Among the three most used sources per newspaper, “Coalition soldiers” were quoted in *The London Times*, and *The International Herald Tribune*. “UK Prime Minister Tony Blair” was

quoted in *The London Times* and “Russian government officials” and “country experts, opinion leaders and professors” in *The Moscow Times*. “American government officials” were quoted in *The International Herald Tribune*.

In Latin America, “journalists” was the most used source in the three newspapers before the war started. Among the three most used sources, “Country experts, opinion leaders and professors” were quoted in *El Universal Mexico* and *El Universal Venezuela*. UK “Prime Minister Tony Blair” was quoted in *La Nación* and “Mexican government officials” in *El Universal Mexico*. “American government officials” were quoted in *La Nación* and *El Universal Venezuela*.

After the war started, “journalists” was the most used source in the three newspapers. Among the three most used sources, “Coalition soldiers” were quoted in *La Nación* and *El Universal Venezuela* and “Religion leaders” in *La Nación*. “Iraqi people” were quoted in *El Universal Mexico* and *El Universal Venezuela* and “country experts, opinion leaders and professors” in *El Universal Mexico*. “American government officials” were quoted in *El Universal Venezuela*.

Table 1 demonstrates the three most used sources per newspaper one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 1-  
*Newspaper by Source*

Newspaper	Before the war	%	After the war	%
The New York Times	Journalists	320	Journalists	641
		78.0%		64.5%
	American government officials	15	American government officials	86
		3.7%		8.7%
	Coalition soldiers	13	General public	59
		3.2%		5.9%

Table 1 (continued)

The Washington Post	Journalists	241	Journalists	606
		63.9%		63.8%
	Coalition soldiers	30	Coalition soldiers	106
		8.0%		11.2%
	American government officials	28	American government officials	79
		7.4%		8.3%
The San Francisco Chronicle	Journalists	72	Journalists	197
		49.7%		71.6%
	Embedded reporters	34	American government officials	28
		23.4%		10.2%
	General public	14	General public	11
		9.7%		4.0%
			Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	11
				4.0%
The London Times	Journalists	209	Journalists	428
		59.2%		72.5%
	UK government officials	33	UK Prim Min Tony Blair	41
		9.3%		6.9%
	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	26	Coalition soldiers	29
		7.4%		4.9%
The Moscow Times	Journalists	11	Journalists	65
		35.5%		39.9%
	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	10	Russian government officials	30
		32.3%		18.4%
	Russian government officials	7	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	13
		22.6%		8.0%
The International Herald Tribune	Journalists	263	Journalists	557
		48.9%		63.9%
	American government officials	58	American government officials	96
		10.8%		11.0%
	Coalition soldiers	31	Coalition soldiers	78
		5.8%		9.0%
La Nación	Journalists	33	Journalists	265
		51.6%		60.2%
	American government officials	8	Religious leaders	32
		12.5%		7.3%
	UK prim min Tony Blair	7	Coalition soldiers	24
		10.9%		5.5%
El Universal Mexico	Journalists	146	Journalists	290
		58.6%		56.2%
	Mexican government officials	20	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	44
		8.0%		8.5%
	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	19	Iraqi People	27
		7.6%		5.2%
El Universal Venezuela	Journalists	34	Journalists	91
		60.7%		58.3%
	American government officials	6	American government officials	11
		10.7%		7.1%
	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	5	Iraqi people	11
		8.9%		7.1%
			Coalition soldiers	11
				7.1%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 6034.22, df: 527, p<.001



### “Newspaper by News Framing”

RQ2: Which frames were used by each newspaper one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since the Phi value was  $< 0.001$ . (Table 2)

In United States, among the three most used news frames before the war started, “economic issues” was framed in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* and “various” in *The New York Times* and *The San Francisco Chronicle*. “Popular international disagreement” was framed in the *The Washington Post* and *The San Francisco Chronicle* and “war operation, strategies, and organization” in *The New York Times*, while “American President Bush and Bush Administration” were framed in *The San Francisco Chronicle*.

After the war started, “war operation, strategies, and organization” was framed in the three newspapers. “Various” and “Economic issues” were framed in *The New York Times* and *The San Francisco Chronicle* and “media” and “American political decisions” in *The Washington Post*.

In Europe, among the three most used news frames before the war started, “political international disagreement” was framed in the three newspapers. “War operation, strategies and organization” was framed in *The London Times* and *The International Herald Tribune*. The third most used framed was “allies political leaders” in *The London Times*, “diplomacy” in *The Moscow Times*, and “United Nations” in *The International Herald Tribune*.

After the war started, “War operation, strategies and organization” was framed in *The London Times* and *The International Herald Tribune*, and “political international disagreement” was framed in *The Moscow Times*, and *The International Herald Tribune*. “Allies people and

public opinion” and “Iraqi president Saddam Hussein” were framed in *The London Times* among the three most used frames and “popular country disagreement” and “Iraqi people” in *The Moscow Times*. “Iraqi soldiers and war strategies” was framed in *The International Herald Tribune*.

In Latin America, among the three most used news frames before the war started, “War operation, strategies and organization” and “political international disagreement” were framed in the three newspapers. “Popular international disagreement” was framed in *La Nación* and “United Nations” was framed in *El Universal Mexico* among the three most used news frames. “Oil” was framed in *El Universal Venezuela*.

After the war started, “War operation, strategies and organization” was framed in the three newspapers. “Political international disagreement” was framed in *La Nación* and *El Universal Mexico*. The third most used frame was “allies’ causalities” in *La Nación* and Media in *El Universal Mexico*. “Iraqi people” and “Oil” were framed in *El Universal Venezuela*.

Table 2 demonstrates the three most used news frames per newspaper one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 2-  
*Newspaper by News Framing*

Newspaper	Before the war	%	After the war	%
The New York Times	Various	59 14.4%	War operation, strategies, and organization	213 21.4%
	War operation, strategies, and organization	57 13.9%	Economic issues	136 13.7%
	Economic issues	48 11.7%	Various	83 8.4%
The Washington Post	Economic issues	64 17.0%	War operation, strategies, and organization	251 26.4%
	Popular international disagreement	44 11.7%	Media	127 13.4%
	Media	36 9.5%	American political decisions	65 6.8%

Table 2 (continued)

The San Francisco Chronicle	Popular international disagreement	24	War operation, strategies, and organization	70
	American President Bush and Bush Administration	16.6% 23	Various	25.5% 46
	Various	15.9% 23	Economic issues	16.7% 24
		15.9%		8.7%
The London Times	Political international disagreement	58	War operation, strategies, and organization	119
	War operation, strategies, and organization	16.4% 46	Allies people and public opinion	20.2% 54
	Allies political leaders	13.0% 30	Iraqi president Saddam Hussein	9.2% 49
The Moscow Times		8.5%		8.3%
	Moral, Ethics, Phil approach, criticism	18	Political international disagreement	55
	Diplomacy	58.1% 6	Popular country disagreement.	33.7% 19
The Intern. Herald Tribune	Political international disagreement	19.4% 4	Iraqi people	11.7% 25
		12.9%		15.3%
	War operation, strategies, and organization	124	War operation, strategies, and organization	363
La Nación	United Nations	23.0% 113	Iraqi soldiers and war strategies	41.7% 56
	Political international disagreement	21.0% 85	Political international disagreement	6.4% 56
		15.8%		6.4%
El Universal Mexico	War operation, strategies, and organization	23	War operation, strategies, and organization	118
	Popular international disagreement	35.9% 13	Political international disagreement	26.8% 77
	Political international disagreement	20.3% 11	Allies casualties	17.5% 40
El Universal Venezuela		17.2%		9.1%
	United Nations	57	War operation, strategies, and organization	90
	War operation, strategies, and organization	22.9% 54	Media	17.4% 55
El Universal Venezuela	Political international disagreement	21.7% 27	Political international disagreement	10.7% 45
		10.8%		8.7%
	War operation, strategies, and organization	21	War operation, strategies, and organization	63
El Universal Venezuela	Political international disagreement	37.5% 9	Iraqi people	40.4% 22
	Oil	16.1% 8	Oil	14.1% 14
		14.3%		9.0%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 6770.50 df: 493;  $p < .001$

### “Newspaper by Approach”

RQ3: Which approaches were used by each newspaper one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since the Phi value was  $< 0.001$ . (Table 3)

The factual approach was the most used approach one week before and one week after the war, by *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The San Francisco Chronicle*, *The London Times*, *The International Herald Tribune*, *La Nación*, *El Universal Mexico*, and *El Universal Venezuela*.

The unfavorable approach was the most used approach by *The Moscow Times* one week before the war started. The factual approach was the most used approach by this newspaper the week after the war started.

Table 3-  
*Newspaper by Approach*

Newspaper	Period	Approach			
		Favorable	Unfavorable	Balanced	Factual
The New York Times	Before	104	125	40	141
		24.4%	30.5%	9.8%	34.4%
	After	332	252	54	356
		33.4%	25.4%	5.4%	35.8%
The Washington Post	Before	41	45	2	289
		10.9%	11.9%	.5%	76.7%
	After	41	130	2	777
		4.3%	13.7%	.2%	81.8%
The San Francisco Chr.	Before	24	50	14	57
		16.6%	34.5%	9.7%	39.3%
	After	72	56	17	130
		26.2%	20.4%	6.2%	47.3%
The London Times	Before	7	55	0	291
		2.0%	15.6%	.0%	82.4%
	After	94	145	21	330
		15.9%	24.6%	3.6%	55.9%
The Moscow Times	Before	0	30	1	0
		.0%	96.8%	3.2%	.0%
	After	10	64	2	87
		6.1%	39.3%	1.2%	53.4%
The International Herald Tribune	Before	15	40	3	480
		2.8%	7.4%	.6%	89.2%
	After	35	51	0	785
		4.0%	5.9%	.0%	90.1%

Table 3 (continued)

La Nación	Before	5 7.8%	23 35.9%	1 1.6%	35 54.7%
	After	52 11.8%	155 35.2%	6 1.4%	227 51.6%
El Universal Mexico	Before	5 2.0%	114 45.8%	1 .4%	129 51.8%
	After	16 3.1%	118 22.9%	0 .0%	382 74.0%
El Universal Venezuela	Before	16 28.6%	17 30.4%	1 1.8%	22 39.3%
	After	31 19.9%	62 39.7%	0 .0%	63 40.4%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 639.80 - df: 15;  $p < .001$

### “Region by Sources”

RQ4: *Which sources were used by region one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since the Phi value was  $< 0.001$ . (Table 4)

Before the war started, “journalist” was the most used source in the three regions. Among the three most used sources per region “American government officials” was used in American and European newspapers and “coalition soldiers” only in American newspapers. “Country experts, opinion leaders and professors” was used in Europe and “Other international leaders” was used in Latin America.

After the war started, “journalist” was the most used source in the three regions. Among the three most used sources per region “American government officials” and “coalition soldiers” were used in American and European newspapers and “Country experts, opinion leaders and professors” and “religion leaders” in Latin American newspapers.

Table 4 demonstrates the three most used sources per region one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 4-  
*Region by Source*

Region	Before the war	%	After the war	%
America	Journalists	633	Journalists	1444
		67.9%		65.1%
	Coalition soldiers	50	American government officials	193
		5.4%		8.7%
Europe	American government officials	45	Coalition soldiers	161
		4.8%		7.3%
	Journalists	483	Journalists	1050
		52.4%		64.7%
Latin America	American government officials	73	American government officials	117
		7.9%		7.2%
	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	44	Coalition soldiers	107
		4.8%		6.6%
Latin America	Journalists	213	Journalists	646
		57.7%		58.1%
	Other international leaders (no Europeans)	26	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	49
		7.0%		4.4%
Latin America	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	24	Religious Leaders	47
		6.5%		4.2%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 1643.35 – df: 155; p<.001

#### “Region by News Framing”

RQ5: *Which frames were used by each region one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since the Phi value was < 0.001. (Table 5)

Before the war started, “war operation, strategies and organization” was the most used news frame in the three regions. Among the three most used frames per region “economic issues” and “various” were used in American newspapers and “political international disagreement” and “United Nations” in European and Latin American newspapers.

After the war started, “war operation, strategies and organization” was the most used news frame in the three regions. Among the three most used frames per region “media” was framed by American and Latin American newspapers and “Economic” issues by American Newspapers. “Political international disagreement” was framed in Europe and Latin America and “Iraqi people” in European newspapers.

Table 5 demonstrates the three most used news frames per region one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 5-  
*Region by News Framing*

Region	Before the war	%	After the war	%
United States	Economic issues,	127	War operation, strategies and	534
		13.6%	organization	24.1%
	War operation, strategies and	100	Economic issues	221
	organization	10.7%		10.0%
Europe	Various	82	Media	139
		8.8%		6.3%
	War operation, strategies and	170	War operation, strategies and	482
	organization	18.4%	organization	29.7%
Latin America	Political international	147	Political international disagreement	123
	disagreement	15.9%		7.6%
	United Nations	127	Iraqi people	116
		13.8%		7.1%
	War operation, strategies and	98	War operation, strategies and	271
	organization	26.6%	organization	24.4%
	United Nations	64	Political international disagreement	127
		17.3%		11.4%
	Political international	47	Media	91
	disagreement	12.7%		8.2%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 2390.87- df: 145; p<.001

#### “Region by Approach”

RQ6: *Which approaches were used by each region one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since

the Phi value was < 0.001. (Table 6)

The factual approach was the most used approach one week before and one week after the war in the American, European, and Latin American regions.

Table 6-  
*Region by Approach*

Region	Period	Approach			
		Favorable	Unfavorable	Balanced	Factual
United States	Before	169	220	56	487
		18.1%	23.6%	6.0%	52.3%
	After	445	438	73	1263
		20.1%	19.7%	3.3%	56.9%
Europe	Before	22	125	4	771
		2.4%	13.6%	.4%	83.6%
	After	139	260	23	1202
		8.6%	16.0%	1.4%	74.0%
Latin America	Before	26	154	3	186
		7.0%	41.7%	.8%	50.4%
	After	99	335	6	672
		8.9%	30.1%	.5%	60.4%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 639.80 - df: 15; p<.001

#### “Editorials vs News Stories”

RQ7: *Which sources, news frames and approaches were the most used in editorials and news stories one week before and one week after the Iraqi war began?*

A chi-square test revealed that the following results had a significant relationship since the Phi value was < 0.001. (Table 7)

News stories maintained similar sources reported in the table 4 (region by source), but there was a significant difference in the sources used in editorials per region. Before the war started, “journalists” and “country experts, opinion leaders and professors” were among the three most



used sources in American and European newspapers. “Cannot tell” was the third most used type of source in America and “other international leaders” were quoted in Latin American newspapers.

After the war started, “journalists” was the most used source in the three regions in editorials and “country experts, opinion leaders and professors” in American and European newspapers. The third most used source in America was “cannot tell”, in Europe “American government officials” and in Latin America “coalition soldiers” and “embedded reporters.”

Table 7 demonstrates the three most used sources per region in news stories and editorials one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 7-  
*Written Piece by Source*

Region		Before the war	%	After the war	%
United States	News Stories	Journalists	558	Journalists	1352
			66.8%		64.5%
		Coalition soldiers	50	American Government officials	193
			6.0%		9.2%
		American Government officials	43	Coalition soldiers	160
			5.1%		7.6%
	Editorials	Journalists	75	Journalists	92
			77.3%		74.8%
		Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	8	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	13
			8.2%		10.6%
		Cannot tell	4	Cannot tell	13
			4.1%		10.6%
Europe	News Stories	Journalists	475	Journalists	1037
			52.5%		65.9%
		American Government officials	73	American Government officials	112
			8.1%		7.1%
		UK Government Officials	43	Coalition soldiers	107
			4.8%		6.8%
	Editorials	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	10	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	26
			55.6%		51.0%
		Journalists	8	Journalists	13
			44.4%		25.5%
				American Government officials	5
					9.8%

Table 7 (continued)

Latin A	News Stories	Journalists	213	Journalists	599
			59.0%		56.8%
		Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	24	Country experts, opinion leaders and professors	49
			6.6%		4.6%
		Mexican Government officials	20	Religious Leaders	47
			5.5%		4.5%
	Editorials	Other International leaders	8	Journalists	47
			100%		81%
				Embedded Reporters	10
					17.2%
				Coalition Soldiers	1
					1.7%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square 3,289.40– df: 341;  $p < .001$

News stories maintained similar frames reported in the Table 5 (region by news framing), but there was a significant difference in the frames used in editorials per region. Before the war started, “moral, ethics, philosophical approach, and criticism” was used in American and European editorials among the three most used frames and “United Nations” was used in America. “Political international disagreement” and “Iraqi reconstruction” were used in Latin American editorials.

After the war started, “moral, ethics, philosophical approach, and criticism” was used in American and European editorials among the three most used frames and “Middle East” in American editorials. “Political international disagreement” was used in European and Latin American editorials, and “Iraqi reconstruction” was used in Europe. “Media” was the third most used frame in editorials in Latin America.

Table 8 demonstrates the most used news frames per region in news stories and editorials one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 8-  
Written Piece by News Framing

Region		Before the war	%	After the war	%
United States	News Stories	Economic issues	127	War operation, strategies and organization	523
			15.2%		25.0%
		War operation, strategies and organization	94	Economic issues	211
			11.3%		10.1%
		Various	79	Media	136
			9.5%		6.5%
		Popular International Disagreement	75		
			9.0%		
	Editorials	American President Bush	22	Moral, Ethics, Phil approach, criticism	16
			22.7%		13.0%
		United Nations	20	Middle East	12
			20.6%		9.8%
		Moral, Ethics, Phil approach, criticism	12	War operation, strategies and organization	11
			12.4%		8.9%
Europe	News Stories	War operation, strategies and organization	170	War operation, strategies and organization	478
			18.8%		30.4%
		Political International Disagreement	147	Political International Disagreement	116
			16.3%		7.4%
		United Nations	127	Iraqi People	114
			14.0%		7.2%
	Editorials	Moral, Ethics, Phil approach, criticism	8	Iraqi Reconstruction	9
			100%		17.6%
				Political International Disagreement	7
					13.7
				Moral, Ethics, Phil approach, criticism	6
					11.8
Latin A	News Stories	War operation, strategies and organization	98	War operation, strategies and organization	259
			27.1%		24.6%
		United Nations	64	Political International Disagreement	120
			17.7%		11.4%
		Political International Disagreement	41	Media	78
			11.4		7.4%
				Iraqi People	72
					6.8%
	Editorials	Political International Disagreement	6	Political International Disagreement	7
			75%		12.1%
		Iraqi Reconstruction	2	War operation, strategies and organization	12
			25%		20.7%
				Media	13
					22.4%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square: 4036.59 df: 319; p<.001

The factual approach was the most used approach in news stories. The unfavorable approach was the most used approach in editorials. There were not significant differences in the approaches used in news stories and editorials before an after war started. Table 9 demonstrates the

approaches per region in news stories and editorials one week before and one week after the war started.

Table 9-  
*Written Piece by Approach*

			Approach			
Region	WP		Favorable	Unfavorable	Balanced	Factual
United States	News St	Before	140	180	54	461
			16.8%	21.6%	6.5%	55.2%
		After	427	398	64	1207
			20.4%	19.0%	3.1%	57.6%
	Editorials	Before	29	40	2	26
			29.9%	41.2%	2.1%	26.8%
		After	18	40	9	56
			14.6%	32.5%	7.3%	45.5%
Europe	News St	Before	22	107	4	771
			2.4%	11.8%	.4%	85.3%
		After	129	242	23	1179
			8.2%	15.4%	1.5%	75.0%
	Editorials	Before	0	18	0	0
			.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
		After	10	18	0	23
			19.6%	35.3%	.0%	45.1%
Latin America	News St	Before	26	148	3	184
			7.2%	41.0%	.8%	51.0%
		After	98	300	6	650
			9.3%	28.5%	.6%	61.7%
	Editorials	Before	0	6	0	2
			.0%	75.0%	.0%	25%
		After	1	35	0	22
			1.7%	60.3%	.0%	37.9%

Note. N: 7,178; Chi-square 855.89– df: 33;  $p < .001$

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

#### Discussion: Sources Used

Most newspapers tended to use coalition sources framing the stories according to coalition interests.

*The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The International Herald Tribune* used the same sources most of the times: journalists, American governmental officials, and coalition soldiers. Since *The International Herald Tribune* is edited in Paris with a focus on news from all over the world and combines the extensive resources of its own correspondents with those of *The New York Times*, the results were expected to be similar among both newspapers.

*The San Francisco Chronicle* was the American newspaper that used most quotes from the general public, country experts, opinion leaders, and professors. *The New York Times* used them as well but mainly after the war started.

The three most used sources by American newspapers between the week before and the week after the war were the same: journalists, coalition soldiers, and American governmental officials. Contrary to the week before the conflict, once the war started, American governmental officials were quoted more often than coalition soldiers. Once the war started, there was a large amount of popular protests all around the country, and government officials were quoted pretty often in different topics concerning the war.

In Europe, newspapers tended to quote 1) the general public and 2) country experts, opinion leaders, and professors as much as government sources. In doing so, they organized the stories according to the interests of different people. The European government officials were highly quoted as well, since this war involved a high international political disagreement and

Spain, United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Russia were crucial during the debates prior to war.

The four most used sources by European newspapers during the week before and the week after the war were: 1) journalists, 2) American governmental officials, 3) coalition soldiers, and 4) country experts, opinion leaders, and professors. After the war started, coalition soldiers were quoted more often than country experts, opinion leaders, and professors. Even though most European countries did not support the war, once the conflict started they supported their troops and they were focused on the coalition soldiers.

Latin American newspapers, mainly *El Universal* Venezuela, quoted coalition leaders as much as Iraqi people. *La Nación* used large number of quotes from religious leaders. Catholic institutions are very involved in the political process of the country since 98 percent of its population is catholic. *El Universal* Mexico used a large number of quotes from Mexican governmental officials since Mexico was part of the UN Security Council and was one of the countries that voted against the war. This produced large debate in the media in the days before the war, and it was highly newsworthy.

The four sources most used by Latin American newspapers during the week before and the week after the war were: 1) journalists, 2) country experts, opinion leaders and professors, 3) other international leaders (no Europeans), and 4) religious leaders. After the war started, religious leaders were quoted more often than other international leaders (no Europeans). Being a Catholic region it was not unexpected that religious leaders would be involved in the decision process of the region.

There were significant differences in the sources used in news stories and editorials before and after the war in all regions.

### Discussion: News Framing Used

Most newspapers tended to frame the stories around war operation, strategies, and organization (dominated by the coalition soldiers). In doing so, the perception of the conflict could be controlled by the coalition interests.

American newspapers focused their framing around economic issues, war operation, various, and media. Since the United States was a central part of this war, it was expected that its economy would be affected by the conflict. American newspapers covered several economic topics, such as stock market, oil, and war funds, among others. These newspapers did not cover as many political disagreement issues as the other regions did. However, *The Washington Post* and *The San Francisco Chronicle* published a large number of news stories based on popular international disagreement. There was not a significant difference between the week before and the week after the conflict started in American newspapers. Economic issues and war operation coverage had the highest coverage before and after the war. Before the war, various was the third most used frame, and after the war the third most used frame was media.

European and Latin American newspapers focused their framing around political international disagreement, United Nations debates, Iraqi people, and media effects. Since European and Latin American countries were decisive in the United Nations decisions, this caused a large public and political debate in the media. The newspapers from both continents tended to report a 'bigger' picture than American newspapers, framing a larger scope and more issues of the conflict, such as the Iraqi people. As this war was reported continuously from the battlefield, media played an important and strategic role in the communication and promotional process of coalition interests. The newspapers were aware of the important role that they were playing in this

war and covered different media topics, such as embedded journalism, internet media, coverage of the bombings, etc.

*The London Times* published several news stories based on Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and coalition public opinion. *The Moscow Times* framed a large number of stories based on diplomacy and moral and ethical standards. *The International Herald Tribune* covered a large number of stories of Iraqi war strategies and soldiers.

*El Universal Venezuela* framed a large number of stories around oil issues before and after the conflict.

There was a significant difference in the frames used during the week before and the week after the conflict started in European and Latin American newspapers. War operation and political international disagreement coverage had the highest coverage before and after the war in both regions. Before the war, United Nations was the third most used frame in Europe and Latin America and after the war the third frame most used was “Iraqi people” by European newspapers and media by Latin American newspapers. This can be expected since the week before the war the conflict was focused on United Nations debates; and once the war started the United Nations was out of the game, and the European newspapers focused mainly on the victims of this war, the Iraqi people. On the other hand, media played such an important role in controlling the big picture of this conflict that they turned out to be a new newsworthy issue to be covered by the media.

There were significant differences in the news framing of news stories and editorials before and after the war started. Before the war, news stories and editorials framed their content around political and economical issues, such as: 1) Political International Disagreement, 2) United Nations, and 3) economic issues. After the war started, they added to their content issues such as: 1) Iraqi people, 2) Iraqi reconstruction, 3) media, and 4) Middle East.



### Discussion: Approach Used

All the newspapers used a factual coverage of the war in Iraq the most before and after the conflict started.

The American newspapers tended to have more favorable coverage after rather than before the war. According the literature review, this can be a result of people supporting their troops, but it does not necessarily mean that they supported their government decisions. Before the war started, out of the American newspapers, *The New York Times* published the largest number of favorable (24.4 percent) and balanced stories (9.8 percent), *The Washington Post* published the largest number of factual stories (76.7 percent), and the *San Francisco Chronicle* published the largest number of unfavorable stories (34.5 percent). After the war started, *The New York Times* published the largest number of favorable (33.4 percent) and unfavorable (25.4 percent) stories, and *The San Francisco Chronicle* published the largest number of balanced (6.2 percent) and factual stories (47.3 percent).

The European coverage tended to be divided once the conflict started. Before the war, the factual stories represented 83.6 percent of the coverage, and the favorable and unfavorable stories represented 2.4 percent and 13.6 percent respectively. After the conflict started, the factual stories represented 74.0 percent of the coverage, and the favorable and unfavorable stories represented 8.6 percent and 16.0 percent respectively. This difference may have been caused by the fact that people were supporting their troops. Once the diplomatic stance was left behind, people and media were more focused on what was going on in the war and there were more favorable stories than before the war. *The Moscow Times* published the largest number of unfavorable (96.8 percent) and balanced (3.2 percent) stories; *The International Herald Tribune* published the largest number of

factual stories (89.2 percent) and favorable stories (2.8 percent). After the war started *The London Times* published the largest percentage of favorable (15.8 percent) and balanced (3.6 percent) stories; *The Moscow Times* published the largest percentage of unfavorable stories (39.3 percent); and *The International Herald Tribune* published the largest percentage of factual stories (90.1 percent). As *The International Herald Tribune* has resources from *The New York Times*, it would be expected that it would have a large favorable coverage. As the UK was the most important ally of United States, it would be expected to have more favorable stories than *The Moscow Times*, since Russia was one of the biggest opponents to this war and its coverage was highly negative towards the U.S. position on the war.

Before the war, on the Latin American coverage, the factual stories represented 50.4 percent of the coverage and favorable, unfavorable, and balanced stories represented 7.0 percent, 41.7 percent, and 0.8 percent. After the conflict started, the factual stories represented 60.4 percent of the coverage and favorable, unfavorable, and balance stories represented 8.9 percent, 30.1 percent, and 0.5 percent respectively. Latin American coverage had a pretty high unfavorable treatment. There were not countries from Latin America that participated in the coalition military operation and all the Latin countries represented in the UN Security Council opposed the war. So there was not that much coverage supporting the U.S. position on the war. *El Universal Venezuela* published the largest number of favorable (26.8 percent) and balanced (1.8 percent) stories, *La Nación* published the largest number of factual stories (54.7 percent) and *El Universal Mexico* published the largest number of unfavorable stories (45.8 percent). During the week before the war started, Mexican government officials were dealing with the U.N. Security Council and there was a large number of negative coverage about the war.

After the war started, *El Universal* Venezuela published the largest number of favorable (19.9 percent) and unfavorable (39.7 percent) stories. As the Venezuela economy is based on its oil industry, there was a large number of negative coverage over oil issues, American intentions in this conflict that caused highly unfavorable coverage. *El Universal* Mexico published the largest number of factual stories (74.0 percent) and *La Nación* published the largest number of balanced stories (1.4 percent).

The factual approach was the most used approach in news stories. The unfavorable approach was the most used approach in editorials. There were significant differences in the approaches used in news stories and editorials before and after war started but in European and American editorials. Editorials tended to be critical, so as this war was so politically controversial it was expected that editorials would be unfavorable towards the U.S. position at war. However, after the war started American and European editorials tended to be supportive of the U.S. position. This can be related to the fact that the countries were involved in the military conflict and they were supporting their troops.

### Limitations

Some limitations of this study were related to the sample. Since the coders were not able to speak all European languages, they had to work with those newspapers that were in English or Spanish. The researchers used three newspapers from three countries to cover each region and may not represent all the countries from each region. However, the countries that were selected were leaders in their regions. *The International Herald Tribune* has a strong dependence on *the New York Times*' coverage and published several of its news stories. In doing so, the European newspaper's coverage was biased by the news framing used by the American newspaper. It would

have been better if the researcher had used another variable, the Kurds, since they were a very important part of the war process. Some stories did not specify between embedded journalists and nonembedded journalists. One of the main points of this study was to see the effects of embedded journalism on this war, but it was not clear if someone was reporting from Iraq as an embedded reporter or from its media center.

### Covering the War in Iraq

The way in which this conflict was reported has brought different interests together. On the one hand, the Bush administration needed to gain national and international support for its cause, mainly because of the conflict within the United Nations. Since they needed popular consensus for the Iraqi reconstruction they knew that they needed as much propaganda as possible in order to achieve this goal. One of the best strategies was controlling the big picture in Iraq through the embedded journalists and the media center that transmitted news daily. It is important to stress that it was hard for media to be completely objective since, in cases like this war, they depended on official sources to reach newsworthy information. In doing so, they lost control of their news report. In their book “Reporting from the Front,” Judith Sylvester and Suzanne Huffman transcribed the comment of one of the embedded journalists in this war, who said: “*We were tethered to them [Coalition soldiers] for transportation. We could not break away. If our unit was moving, we had to move with them and could only rarely stop to talk to Iraqis.*” (Sylvester, 2005, p. 214). On the other hand, several international newspapers relied on the Associated Press to cover the war, and in doing so, they transmitted the same framing that the coalition media created.

However, the main criticism surrounding media coverage is not related to what they wrote about but what they did not write about. American media failed to cover more than half of the “big

picture”. They lacked coverage of Iraqi sources or framing and of the international disagreement, two main parts of this conflict. This analysis represents how public opinion can be shaped differently according to the media to which they are exposed.

Under the given previous circumstances of the war, the Bush Administration gained public support. Media framed the conflict under the Bush Administration’s interests. Besides that media as part of society, cannot be completely objective if their country is at war as we have seen, there was a significant difference between the European and Latin American media frames and the American one. The first two regions framed a “bigger and more balanced picture” in covering more sides of the war and quoting diverse sources while American media covered a narrower range of war perspectives and quoted coalition sources in almost all of their news stories. The American media did not describe a “big and accurate picture” of the war as it was expected. They did not maintain their watchdog function within a democratic society and failed at their duty of providing topics of public debate to enrich their own society and democratic values, something that characterized the American society.

Most coverage did not include a large number of balanced stories; which implies that journalists did not cover the different sides of the issue. They either covered one side of the conflict or did not legitimately cover any side.

The media industry is a business enterprise, and one of the primary concerns is to sell stories; at the same time, the media’s duty is to provide debate, history, context, and reporting on the decisions that the government takes related to the war in Iraq. Since, words, images and the media coverage of specific issues stimulate support of or opposition to the sides in a political and international conflict, journalists should present valuable information in order to provide a means to understand how the war is framed or portrayed by different interests.

Ron Hutcheson from the Chicago Tribune said that media experts note that a journalist's job is to report what's happening and why, not to rally support, and that news judgment requires assessing which facts are most important. If schools are being rebuilt, that is a news story, but if the society they are in is being blown apart by civil war, that is a bigger news story<sup>1</sup>.

Civic journalism can offer a solution for the framing process. Peter Parisi (1997) analyzes civic journalism related to the construction of the stories. He says that journalists should understand that what they present to the reader is not a mirror image of truth, but a coherent narrative of the world that serves particular purposes. According to him, what the press covers could become more flexible and better suited to our needs as readers and writers if journalists would see news as narratives, and inevitably, invoke particular social values. He acknowledges that the facts must be framed somehow and should be framed by asking systematically how social problems can be solved and by tracing opportunities and obstacles.

## NOTES

### CHAPTER 2- LITERATURE REVIEW

<sup>1</sup> *The Wall Street Journal, USA Today, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, New York Daily News, Chicago Tribune, Newsday, Houston Chronicle and the Dallas Morning News.*

<sup>2</sup> “Information Operations,” US Department of the Army, Public Affairs Tactics, Techniques and Procedures, Field Manual. Accessed 02 February, 2006. Available <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-61-1/>

### CHAPTER 4- METHODOLOGY

<sup>1</sup>Coalition of the Willing: groups of nations acting collectively and often militarily outside of the jurisdiction of the United Nations mandates and administration. The Coalition of the Willing contains about a fifth (38 of 193) of the world's countries in the war of Iraq, among them there are 25 countries with military involvement and 10 without. Among the countries with military involvement there are: USA, United Kingdom, South Korea, Italy, Poland, Ukraine, Georgia, Romania, Australia, Japan, Denmark, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Mongolia, Azerbaijan, Latvia, Albania, Lithuania, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Estonia, Macedonia, Kazakhstan and Norway. Among the countries without military involvement there are: Uzbekistan, Angola, Colombia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kuwait, Micronesia, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, and Uganda.

### CHAPTER 6- CONCLUSION

<sup>1</sup> Hutcheson, Rom. *Mainstream news media suffer collateral damage from Iraq war.* The Chicago Tribune. August 21, 2005

## REFERENCES

- Brewer, Paul; Graf, Joseph; and Willnat, Lars. "Priming or framing: media influence on attitudes toward foreign countries." Gazette. vol. 65, no. 6, (Dec. 2003): 493-508.
- Dimitrova, Daniela and Lee Kaid, Lynda. "War on the Web: The immediate news framing of Gulf War II" Harvard International Journal Of Press/Politics. 10 (2005):22-44.
- Entman, Robert. "Cascading activation: contesting the White House's frame after 9/11." Political Communication. 20 (Oct.-Dec. 2003): 415-432.
- Haumann, Wilhelm and Peterson, Thomas. "German public opinion on the Iraq conflict: A passing crisis with the U.S.A. or a lasting departure?" International Journal of Public Opinion Research. 16 (2004): 311-330.
- Hiebert, Ray. "Public relations and propaganda in framing the Iraq war: a preliminary review." Public Relations Review. 29 (Sept. 2003): 243-255.
- Lehmann, Ingrid. "Exploring the transatlantic media divide over Iraq: How and why U.S. and German media differed in reporting on UN weapons inspections in Iraq, 2002-2003." The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics. 10 (2005): 63-89.
- Lewis, Justin. "Television, public opinion, and the *war in Iraq*: The case of Britain." International Journal of Public Opinion. 16 (2004): 297-310.
- Liebes, Tamar. "Our war/their war: comparing the intifadeh and the Gulf War on U.S. and Israeli television." Critical Studies in Mass Communication. 9 (March 1992): 44-55.
- Lule, Jack. "War and its metaphors: news language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003" Journalism Studies. 5 (May 2004): 179-190.



Nisbet, M. C.; Brossard, D.; and Kroepsch, A. "Framing science: the stem cell controversy in an age of press/politics." Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics. 8 (spring 2003): 36-70.

Nord, Lards and Stromback, Jesper. "Mission impossible? Some notes on journalistic shortcomings in the coverage of war and terrorism." Nordicom Review. 24 (Dec. 2003): 127-141.

Parisi, Peter. "Toward a "philosophy of framing": news narratives for public journalism." Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly. 74 (Winter 1997): 673-686.

Payne, Kenneth. "The Media as an Instrument of War." Parameters, US Army War College Quarterly. (Spring 2005): 81-93.

Pfau, Micahel ; Haigh, Michael.; and Gettle, Mitchell. "Embedding journalists in military combat units: Impact on newspaper story frames and tone." Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly. 81 (2004):74-88.

Ryan, Michael. "Framing the war against terrorism: U.S. newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan." Gazette. 66 (2004): 363-382.

Shen, Fuyuan. "Effects of news frames and schemas on individuals' issue interpretations and attitudes." Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly. 81 (2004) 400-416.

Simon, Adam. "Unified method for analyzing media framing." In Communication in U.S. elections: new agendas. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers (2001): 75-89.

Sylvester, Judith and Huffman Suzanne. Reporting from the Front United States of America: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Trivundza, Ilija. "Orientalism as news: Pictorial representations of the U.S. attack on Iraq in Delo."

Journalism. 5 (2004): 480-499.

Tumber, Howard and Palmer, Jerry. Media at War. The Iraqi crisis. California, SAGE Publications Ltd, 2004.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### Codebook

1- Record the newspaper's name:

Category	Code
The New York Times	1
The Washington Post	2
The San Francisco Chronicle	3
The London Times	4
The Moscow Times	5
The International Herald Tribune	6
La Nación	7
El Universal (Mexico)	8
El Universal (Venezuela)	9

2- Record the date when the news story was published:

Category	Code
March 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	12
March 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	13
March 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	14
March 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	15
March 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	16
March 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	17
March 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	18
March 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	19
March 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	20
March 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2003	21
March 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2003	22
March 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2003	23

Category	Code
March 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	24
March 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	25
March 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2003	26

3- Record the article's number:

Category	Code
1	1
2	2
3 (...)	3

4- Record the kind of written piece that the article is

Category	Code
News Story	1
Editorial	2

5- Record the number of the paragraph that you are analyzing:

Category	Code
1	1
2	2
3 (...)	3

6- Record the source of the information written on the paragraph

Category	Code
Journalist / News Agency	1
Embedded Reporters	2
American President George Bush	3

Category	Code
American Government Officials	4
UK Prime Minister Tony Blair's	5
UK Government Officials	6
Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar	7
Spanish Government Officials	8
German Chancellor Schroeder	9
German Government Officials	10
French President Jack Chirac	11
French Government Officials	12
Russian President Vladimir Putin	13
Russian Government Officials	14
Other European Government Officials	15
Argentinean President Dr. Eduardo Duhalde	16
Argentinean Government Officials	17
Mexican President Dr. Vicente Fox	18
Mexican Government Officials	19
Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez	20
Venezuelan Government Officials	21
Other International Leaders (No European)	22
UN Secretary General Kofi Annan	23
UN representatives	24
Country experts/ opinion leaders/ professors	25
Iraqi President Saddam Hussein	26
Iraqi Government Officials	27
Iraqi People	28
General Public	29
Coalition Soldiers – Military	30
Iraqi Soldiers – Military	31
Religious Leaders	32

Category	Code
Economic Specialists	33
Various	34
Can't Tell	0

7- Record the framing of the paragraph

Category	Code
Saddam Hussein	1
Iraqi People, Public Opinion	2
Iraqi Soldiers, War Strategies	3
Iraqi Reconstruction	4
Iraqi Casualties	5
Al Qaeda/ Bin Laden	6
Afghanistan	7
Allies People/ Public Opinion	8
Allies Soldiers	9
Allies Casualties	10
Allies Political Leaders	11
American President Bush (Bush Administration)	12
American Political decisions	13
US Lead Operation	14
Political International Disagreement	15
Popular Intern Disagreement (protest)P. Opinion	16
Popular Country Disagreement	17
Diplomacy	18
UN	19
War Operation, Strategies, Organization	20
WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction	21
Terrorist	22
Middle East	23

Category	Code
Oil	24
Past Wars	25
Economic Issues	26
Humanitarian Aid	27
Moral, Ethics, Philosophical approaches, Criticism	28
Various: Food, water, Religion	29
Media	30
Can't Tell	0

Conceptualization of same variables:

Category	Code	Conceptualization
American President Bush (Bush Administration)	12	Stories that cover the President personal life or character and his administration organization will be coded as 12
American Political decisions	13	Stories that cover American political decision taken by the President Bush or his administration related to the war or its collateral damages or other related issues will be coded as 13
US Lead Operation	14	Stories that cover the US lead operation over the war will be coded as 14. They have to specify the leadership of the American soldiers on the battlefield.
Political International Disagreement	15	Stories that cover political International disagreement over the war will be coded as 16. Diplomacy and UN issues will be coded differently.
Popular Intern Disagreement (protest) - Public Opinion	16	Stories that cover popular protest in other countries than the country of the newspaper will be coded as 16.
Popular Country Disagreement	17	Stories that cover popular protest in the country of the newspaper will be coded as 17.

## 8- Record the approach of the framing

Category	Code	Conceptualization
Favorable	1	A paragraph will be coded as favorable if it reflects positively the U.S. position in the Iraq war; highlights the U.S. military or the coalition of the Willing talents or accomplishments in the war; associates the U.S. or its coalition with positive characteristics or actions; or honors their culture or people.
Unfavorable	2	A paragraph will be coded as unfavorable if it reflects negatively on the U.S. position in the Iraq war; associates the US. or the coalition of the Willing with unethical, illegal, or immoral behavior; suggests the US or any of its coalition's countries was a source of problem; or associates them with a negative experience of failure
Balanced	3	A paragraph will be coded as balanced if the paragraph is positive and negative toward the U.S. position in the Iraq war, because it provided nearly equal amounts of positive and negative information.
Factual	4	A paragraph will be coded as factual if the position taken by the journalist is unclear because he/she describes just facts of a story without openly framing it. For example, if the news information does not clearly take a favorable, unfavorable or balanced position toward the U.S. position in the war.



## APPENDIX B

### Main Tables in Percentages

X. Newspaper by Source

XI. Newspaper by News Frame

XII. Region by Source

XIII. Region by News Frame

XIV. Written Piece by Source

XV. Written Piece by News Frame

Table 10  
Newspaper by Source

		Can't Tell	Journalist	Embedded Reporters	Am. Pres. G. Bush	Am Gov Officials	UK PM T. Blair	UK Gov Officials	SP. PM J.M. Aznar	Sp Gov Officials	Germ. Ch. Schroeder	Ger Gov Officials	Fr. Pres. J. Chirac	Fr. Gov Officials	Russ . Pres. V. Putin	Russ Gov Officials	Other Eur Officials	Arg Pres. Duhalde	Arg Gov Officials
Before the War																			
Newspaper	NYT	.0	78.0	.2	.7	3.7	2.4	.2	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	WP	.0	63.9	.0	1.1	7.4	.0	.5	.0	.0	.0	.0	.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	SFC	2.8	49.7	23.4	.7	1.4	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	LT	.3	59.2	.0	.8	4.0	4.8	9.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	MT	.0	35.5	.0	3.2	3.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	3.2	.0	22.6	.0	.0	.0
	IHT	.0	48.9	.0	6.1	10.8	2.2	1.9	.0	.2	.0	.2	1.9	1.7	.4	.0	2.8	.0	.0
	LN	.0	51.6	.0	.0	12.5	10.9	1.6	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	EUM	.0	58.6	.0	2.0	2.0	2.4	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.2	.0	.4	.0	.0	.0	.0	9.4
	EUV	.0	60.7	.0	.0	10.7	.0	.0	.0	2.4	.0	.0	1.8	.0	.4	.0	1.8	.0	.0
Total		.2	59.8	1.6	2.2	6.2	2.3	2.1	.0	.3	.0	.2	.5	.5	.0	.3	.7	.0	.3
After the War																			
Newspaper	NYT	.0	64.5	.0	1.3	8.7	1.2	.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	.0	.7	.0	.0
	WP	.0	63.8	3.3	.8	8.3	.0	.1	.0	.4	.0	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	.0	.0	.0
	SFC	4.7	71.6	.0	.0	10.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	LT	.8	72.5	2.2	.0	2.2	6.9	.8	.0	.0	.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	MT	.0	39.9	8.6	.0	4.9	.0	.6	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.6	8.0	18.4	2.5	.0	.0
	IHT	.0	63.9	.3	1.6	11.0	.2	.8	.0	.0	.1	.2	.0	.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	LN	.0	60.2	2.3	2.3	2.5	.7	.7	.0	.0	.0	.7	.2	.7	.7	.0	1.1	1.4	5.0
	EUM	.0	56.2	.0	1.0	4.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.6	.6	.2	.2	.2	.0	.0	.0
	EUV	.0	58.3	.0	0.6	7.1	.0	1.9	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.6	.0	5.8	.0	.0	.0
Total		.4	63.4	1.4	1.0	7.1	1.2	.4	.0	.1	.0	.2	.1	.2	.4	.8	.3	.1	.4

Table 10 (continued)

		Mex Pres. V. Fox	Mex Gov Officials	Ven. Pres H. Chavez	Ven Gov Officials	Other Int Leaders	UN SG K Annan	UN Representatives	Experts/O.Lead/Prof	Iraqi Pres S Hussein	Iraqi Gov Officials	Iraqi People	General Public	Coalition Soldiers	Iraqi Soldiers	Religious Leaders	Economic Specialists	Various
Before the War																		
Newspaper	NYT	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.9	.5	.2	.2	.0	.0	.2	2.7	3.2	.0	1.2	2.7	.5
	WP	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.1	2.7	.3	.0	6.1	2.7	8.0	.0	.0	5.0	.0
	SFC	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.4	.0	4.1	.0	.0	.0	9.7	4.8	.0	.0	2.1	.0
	LT	.0	.0	.0	.0	4.2	.0	.0	7.4	.0	.0	4.2	2.5	.3	.8	.0	2.0	.0
	MT	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	32.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	IHT	.2	.4	.0	.0	2.4	.9	2.0	1.5	.4	1.7	.2	3.3	5.8	.7	.0	3.2	.4
	LN	.0	.0	.0	.0	4.7	.0	1.6	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	7.8	.0
	EUM	.8	8.0	.0	.0	8.8	.4	.0	7.6	.8	.8	.0	2.8	.4	.0	.0	.0	.0
	EUV	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.8	.0	.0	8.9	.0	3.6	.0	.0	3.6	.0	.0	7.1	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>.4</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>.2</b>
After the War																		
Newspaper	NYT	.0	.4	.0	.0	4.3	.0	.1	1.5	.6	.2	.4	5.9	4.5	.1	.3	3.4	1.5
	WP	.0	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	.8	3.3	.0	.0	3.2	3.7	11.2	.0	.0	.8	.0
	SFC	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.1	.0	.0	4.0	.0	.0	.0	4.0	3.6	.0	.0	.7	.0
	LT	.0	.0	.0	.0	.8	.0	.0	1.2	1.0	.0	.2	3.6	4.9	.8	.7	1.0	.0
	MT	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	3.1	8.0	.0	.0	.0	5.5	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	IHT	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9	.2	1.3	5.4	.8	1.1	1.0	.6	9.0	1.1	.0	.0	.0
	LN	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.7	.0	.0	.0	.2	2.7	.0	2.7	5.5	.5	7.3	.0	.0
	EUM	3.5	4.7	.0	.0	2.7	.0	.0	8.5	.4	.8	5.2	2.1	1.7	.4	2.9	3.5	.4
	EUV	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.6	.0	1.9	3.2	1.3	2.6	7.1	.0	7.1	.0	.0	.0	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>.4</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.3</b>

Table 11  
Newspaper by Frame

		Iraqi Pres S Hussein	Iraqi People	Iraqi Soldiers.	Iraqi Reconstruction	Iraqi Causalities	Al Qaeda / B Laden	Afghanistan	Allies People. P Op	Allies Soldiers	Allies Causalities	Allies Pol Leaders	Am Pres G. Bush	Am. Pol. Decisions	US Lead Operation	Pol Intern Disagrem
Before the War																
Newspaper	NYT	2.7	3.7	.0	2.4	.0	.2	.5	1.2	5.6	.5	.2	5.4	1.0	.0	7.3
	WP	2.4	8.2	.0	3.4	.0	.0	.0	1.1	6.4	.0	.0	3.2	3.2	.0	6.9
	SFC	.7	6.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.7	6.9	.0	.0	15.9	.7	.0	2.1
	LT	5.4	9.3	.0	1.1	.0	3.7	.0	4.2	7.1	1.4	8.5	1.1	5.4	.0	16.4
	MT	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	3.2	.0	12.9
	IHT	8.4	.2	.0	.7	.2	.0	.0	.2	.6	.0	.0	.4	3.3	.0	15.8
	LN	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.8	.0	.0	.0	1.6	.0	17.2
	EUM	.8	1.2	.0	3.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.8	.0	10.8
	EUV	.0	.0	.0	0.	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	7.1	.0	16.1
Total		3.9	4.1	.0	.0	.0	.6	.1	1.2	3.9	.3	1.4	2.8	3.0	.0	.0
After the War																
Newspaper	NYT	5.9	1.2	1.0	.1	1.1	.3	.1	3.9	7.4	4.1	.9	3.8	1.8	1.7	3.5
	WP	1.1	5.5	2.9	2.4	.0	.0	.0	1.8	5.9	1.3	.1	5.3	6.8	.0	1.4
	SFC	8.0	3.6	5.8	.4	.0	.0	.0	1.8	4.4	1.1	.0	1.5	0.	1.5	.0
	LT	8.3	7.6	3.6	.2	.7	.2	.0	9.2	6.8	4.1	1.0	.3	2.2	.0	2.0
	MT	.0	15.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	0.	.0	.0	.0	.6	1.2	.0	33.7
	IHT	3.1	5.3	6.4	3.1	.2	.0	.0	1.4	1.3	.8	.0	3.2	2.8	.0	6.4
	LN	5.9	1.6	1.8	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.0	3.2	9.1	.0	5.9	3.9	.0	17.5
	EUM	1.9	8.3	2.3	.6	.2	.0	.0	.2	.0	.0	.0	.8	7.0	.0	8.7
	EUV	3.8	14.1	.6	.0	1.9	.6	.0	.0	3.2	.6	0	.0	.6	.0	3.2
Total		4.2	5.3	3.1	1.1	.4	.1	.0	2.8	4.3	2.6	.3	3.1	3.6	.4	6.0

Table 11 (continued)

		Popular Int Disagrem	Pop Country Disagr	Diplomacy	UN	War Operation	WMD	Terrorist	Middle East	Oil	Past Wars	Economic Issues	Humanitarian Aid	Moral, Ethics	Various	Media	Can't Tell
<b>Before the War</b>																	
Newspaper	NYT	1.7	.0	7.3	4.4	13.9	1.2	2.7	.0	1.5	4.4	11.7	.0	3.7	14.4	2.4	.0
	WP	11.7	.0	.3	8.0	6.9	5.6	3.7	.0	.5	.8	17.0	1.1	.3	.0	9.5	.0
	SFC	16.6	1.4	9.0	.0	11.7	.0	.7	.0	.0	.7	10.3	.0	.7	15.9	.0	.0
	LT	3.4	.0	.0	3.4	13.0	2.0	.0	.0	.0	.3	8.2	.0	2.5	3.1	.3	.0
	MT	.0	.0	19.4	6.5	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	58.1	.0	.0	.0
	IHT	.9	.0	.6	21.0	23.0	5.8	.6	11.2	.0	.7	5.2	.2	1.1	.0	.0	.0
	LN	20.3	3.1	1.6	7.8	35.9	.0	4.7	.0	.0	.0	7.8	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	EUM	9.6	1.6	.0	22.9	21.7	6.0	.0	5.6	.0	3.6	1.6	1.6	2.0	.4	3.6	.0
	EUV	.0	.0	3.6	3.6	37.5	12.5	1.8	.0	14.3	.0	.0	.0	3.6	.0	.0	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>5.8</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>.0</b>
<b>After the War</b>																	
Newspaper	NYT	3.3	.3	2.5	.2	21.4	2.0	3.0	.4	.9	2.6	13.7	.0	4.2	8.4	.0	.0
	WP	6.0	.0	.1	1.6	26.4	4.5	.6	1.5	.3	2.0	6.4	.3	2.4	.0	13.4	.0
	SFC	.0	5.1	.0	.0	25.5	3.6	1.1	.0	2.5	4.0	8.7	.0	.4	16.7	4.4	.0
	LT	4.6	1.7	.7	4.2	20.2	1.7	3.2	.2	.0	3.1	5.8	.8	2.2	3.9	1.7	.0
	MT	.0	11.7	1.0	3.7	.0	.6	.0	.0	7.4	.0	3.1	3.7	6.7	.0	11.0	.0
	IHT	2.4	.0	.0	1.3	41.7	2.5	.1	.3	.9	2.4	4.5	2.9	1.1	.0	5.9	.0
	LN	3.6	.0	.0	.2	26.8	.0	.7	2.3	.2	2.7	1.4	2.5	2.5	.5	5.7	.0
	EUM	7.9	.0	2.7	1.4	17.4	1.2	1.2	3.3	3.3	1.2	8.3	2.1	5.2	3.9	10.7	.0
	EUV	5.8	.0	.0	.6	40.4	1.9	.6	3.8	9.0	.0	1.9	.0	.0	.0	7.1	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.1</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>.0</b>

Table 12  
Region by Source

Region		Can't Tell	Journalist	Embedded Reporters	Am. Pres. G. Bush	Am Gov Officials	UK PM T. Blair	UK Gov Officials	SP. PM J.M. Aznar	Sp Gov Officials	Germ. Ch. Schroeder	Ger Gov Officials	Fr. Pres. J. Chirac	Fr. Gov Officials	Russ . Pres. V. Putin	Russ Gov Officials	Other Eur Officials	Arg Pres. Duhalde	Arg Gov Officials
America	Before	.4	67.9	3.8	.9	4.8	1.1	.3	.0	.0	.0	.1	.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	After	.6	65.1	1.4	.9	8.7	.5	.1	.0	.2	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	.0	.3	.0	.0
Europe	Before	.1	52.4	.0	4.0	7.9	3.1	4.7	.0	.1	.0	.1	1.1	1.1	.2	.8	1.6	.0	.0
	After	.3	64.7	1.8	.9	7.2	2.6	.8	.0	.0	.1	.1	.0	.2	.8	1.8	.2	.0	.0
Latin A.	Before	.0	57.7	.0	1.4	5.1	3.5	.3	.0	1.6	.0	.8	.3	.3	.3	.0	.3	.0	1.6
	After	.0	58.1	.9	1.4	4.0	.3	.5	.0	.0	.0	.5	.4	.4	.4	.9	.4	.5	2.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>.3</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>.4</b>

Region		Mex Pres. V. Fox	Mex Gov Officials	Ven. Pres H. Chavez	Ven Gov Officials	Other Int Leaders	UN SG K Annan	UN Representatives	Experts/O. Lead/Prof	Iraqi Pres S Hussein	Iraqi Gov Officials	Iraqi People	General Public	Coalition Soldiers	Iraqi Soldiers	Religious Leaders	Economic Specialists	Various
America	Before	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.3	.4	1.0	1.8	.1	.0	2.6	3.8	5.4	.0	.5	3.5	.2
	After	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.2	.0	.4	2.6	.3	.1	1.5	4.7	7.3	.0	.1	2.0	.7
Europe	Before	.0	.1	.0	.0	3.0	.5	1.2	4.8	.2	1.0	1.7	2.9	3.5	.8	.0	2.6	.2
	After	.0	.0	.0	.0	.8	.1	1.0	4.1	.8	.6	.6	2.2	6.6	.9	.2	.4	.0
Latin A.	Before	1.6	.5	.0	.0	7.0	.3	.3	6.5	.5	1.1	.0	1.9	.8	.0	.0	2.4	.0
	After	2.0	1.6	.0	.0	2.7	.0	.3	4.4	.4	1.8	3.4	2.1	4.0	.4	4.2	1.6	.2
<b>Total</b>		<b>.4</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>.3</b>

Table 13  
Region by Frame

Region		Iraqi Pres S Hussein	Iraqi People	Iraqi Soldiers.	Iraqi Reconstruction	Iraqi Casualties	Al Qaeda / B Laden	Afghanistan	Allies People. P Op	Allies Soldiers	Allies Casualties	Allies Pol Leaders	Am Pres G. Bush	Am. Pol. Decisions	US Lead Operation	Pol Intern Disagrem
America	Before	2.3	5.9	.0	2.5	.0	.1	.2	1.1	6.1	.2	.1	6.1	1.8	.0	6.3
	After	4.1	3.3	2.4	1.1	.5	.1	.0	2.7	6.4	2.5	.5	4.1	3.7	.9	2.2
Europe	Before	6.9	3.7	.0	.9	.1	1.4	.0	1.7	3.0	.5	3.3	.7	4.1	.0	15.9
	After	4.7	7.1	4.7	1.7	.4	.1	.0	4.1	3.1	1.9	.4	1.9	2.4	.0	7.6
Latin A.	Before	.5	.8	.0	2.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.5	.0	.0	.0	3.3	.0	12.7
	After	3.8	6.5	1.9	.3	.4	.1	.0	.9	1.8	3.7	.0	2.7	4.9	.0	11.4
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>7.7</b>

Region		Popular Int Disagrem	Pop Country Disagr	Diplomacy	UN	War Operation	WMD	Terrorist	Middle East	Oil	Past Wars	Economic Issues	Humanitarian Aid	Moral, Ethics	Various	Media	Can't Tell
America	Before	8.0	.2	4.7	5.2	10.7	2.8	2.8	.0	.9	2.4	13.6	.4	1.8	8.8	4.9	.0
	After	4.1	.8	1.2	.8	24.1	3.3	1.8	.8	.9	2.5	10.0	.1	3.0	5.8	6.3	.0
Europe	Before	1.8	.0	1.0	13.8	18.4	4.1	.3	6.5	.0	.5	3.2	.1	3.6	1.2	.1	.0
	After	3.0	1.8	.4	2.6	29.7	2.0	1.2	.2	1.2	2.4	4.8	2.2	2.1	1.4	4.9	.0
Latin A.	Before	10.0	1.6	.8	17.3	26.6	6.0	1.1	3.8	2.2	2.4	2.4	1.1	1.9	.3	2.4	.0
	After	5.9	.0	1.3	.8	24.4	.8	.9	3.0	2.9	1.6	4.7	2.0	3.4	2.0	8.2	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.6</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>.0</b>

Table 14  
Written Piece by Source

Region		Can't Tell	Journalist	Embedded Reporters	Am. Pres. G. Bush	Am Gov Officials	UK PM T. Blair	UK Gov Officials	SP. PM J.M. Aznar	Sp Gov Officials	Germ. Ch. Schroeder	Ger Gov Officials	Fr. Pres. J. Chirac	Fr. Gov Officials	Russ . Pres. V. Putin	Russ Gov Officials	Other Eur Officials	Arg Pres. Duhalde	Arg Gov Officials
America	News St Bef	.0	66.8	4.2	.7	5.1	1.2	.4	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	News St Aft	.0	64.5	1.5	1.0	9.2	.6	.1	.0	.2	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	.0	.3	.0	.0
	Editorials Bef	4.1	77.3	.0	2.1	2.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	10.6	74.8	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Europe	News St Bef	.1	52.5	.0	4.1	8.1	3.2	4.8	.0	.1	.0	.1	1.1	1.1	.2	.8	1.7	.0	.0
	News St Aft	.2	65.9	1.9	.9	7.1	2.7	.8	.0	.0	.1	.1	.0	.2	.8	1.9	.3	.0	.0
	Editorials Bef	.0	44.4	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	3.9	25.5	.0	.0	9.8	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Latin America	News St Bef	.0	59.0	.0	1.4	5.3	3.6	.3	.0	1.7	.0	.8	.3	.3	.3	.0	.3	.0	1.7
	News St Aft	.0	56.8	.0	1.5	4.2	.3	.6	.0	.0	.0	.6	.4	.5	.4	.9	.5	.6	2.1
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	.0	17.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>.3</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>.4</b>



Table 14 (continued)

Region		Mex Pres. V. Fox	Mex Gov Officials	Ven. Pres H. Chavez	Ven Gov Officials	Other Int Leaders	UN SG K Annan	UN Representatives	Experts/O. Lead/Prof	Iraqi Pres S Hussein	Iraqi Gov Officials	Iraqi People	General Public	Coalition Soldiers	Iraqi Soldiers	Religious Leaders	Economic Specialists	Various
America	News St Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.4	.5	1.1	1.1	.1	.0	2.9	4.2	6.0	.0	.0	4.0	.2
	News St Aft	.0	.2	.0	.0	2.3	.0	.4	2.1	.3	.1	1.6	4.8	7.6	.0	.1	2.1	.7
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	8.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	5.2	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	10.6	.0	.0	.0	3.3	.8	.0	.0	.0	.0
Europe	News St Bef	.1	.2	.0	.0	3.1	.6	1.2	3.8	.2	1.0	1.8	3.0	3.5	.8	.0	2.7	.2
	News St Aft	.0	.0	.0	.0	.8	.1	1.0	2.6	.8	.6	.6	2.1	6.8	1.0	.1	.4	.0
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	55.6	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	51.0	.0	.0	.0	3.9	.0	.0	5.9	.0	.0
Latin America	News St Bef	.6	5.5	.0	.0	5.0	.3	.3	6.6	.6	1.1	.0	1.9	.8	.0	.0	2.5	.0
	News St Aft	1.7	2.3	.0	.0	2.8	0	.3	4.6	.5	1.9	3.6	2.2	4.1	.4	4.5	1.7	.2
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.7	.0	.0	.0	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>.3</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>.3</b>

Table 15  
Written Piece by Frame

Region		Iraqi Pres S Hussein	Iraqi People	Iraqi Soldiers.	Iraqi Reconstruction	Iraqi Causalities	Al Qaeda / B Laden	Afghanistan	Allies People. P Op	Allies Soldiers	Allies Causalities	Allies Pol Leaders	Am Pres G. Bush	Am. Pol. Decisions	US Lead Operation	Pol Intern Disagrem
<u>America</u>	News St Bef	2.2	6.3	.0	2.8	.0	.1	.0	.8	6.5	.1	.1	4.2	1.9	.0	5.7
	News St Aft	4.2	3.1	2.5	1.1	.5	.1	.0	2.8	6.6	2.5	.5	4.1	3.7	1.0	2.0
	Editorials Bef	3.1	2.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.1	3.1	3.1	1.0	.0	22.7	1.0	.0	11.3
	Editorials Aft	1.6	7.3	1.6	.8	.0	.0	.0	2.4	3.3	2.4	.0	5.7	4.9	.8	5.7
Europe	News St Bef	7.1	3.8	.0	.9	.1	1.4	.0	1.8	3.1	.6	3.3	.7	4.2	.0	16.3
	News St Aft	4.7	7.2	4.9	1.2	.3	.1	.0	4.2	3.2	1.9	.4	2.0	2.3	.0	7.4
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	3.9	3.9	.0	17.6	2.0	.0	.0	.0	2.0	.0	.0	.0	5.9	.0	13.7
Latin A.	News St Bef	.6	.8	.0	1.7	.0	.0	.0	.0	.6	.0	.0	.0	3.3	.0	11.4
	News St Aft	4.0	6.8	2.0	.3	.4	.1	.0	.9	1.9	3.9	.0	2.8	5.0	.0	11.4
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	25.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	75.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.7	.0	12.1
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>7.7</b>

Table 15 (continued)

Region		Popular Int Disagrem	Pop Country Disagr	Diplomacy	UN	War Operation	WMD	Terrorist	Middle East	Oil	Past Wars	Economic Issues	Humanitarian Aid	Moral, Ethics	Various	Media	Can't Tell
America	News St Bef	9.0	.2	5.1	3.4	11.3	2.9	3.1	.0	1.0	2.5	15.2	.0	.6	9.5	5.5	.0
	News St Aft	4.3	.7	1.2	.6	25.0	3.5	1.6	.3	.8	2.4	10.1	.1	2.4	5.9	6.5	.0
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	1.0	20.6	6.2	2.1	.0	.0	.0	1.0	.0	4.1	12.4	3.1	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	1.6	.8	3.3	8.9	.0	4.1	9.8	1.6	4.1	8.1	.8	13.0	4.9	2.4	.0
Europe	News St Bef	1.9	.0	1.0	14.0	18.8	4.2	.3	6.6	.0	.6	6.3	.1	1.7	1.2	.1	.0
	News St Aft	3.0	1.8	.1	2.5	30.4	2.0	1.2	.3	1.1	2.4	5.0	2.2	1.8	1.5	5.0	.0
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	2.0	.0	9.8	5.9	7.8	2.0	2.0	.0	3.9	2.0	.0	2.0	11.8	.0	.0	.0
Latin A.	News St Bef	10.2	1.7	.8	17.7	27.1	6.1	1.1	3.9	2.2	2.5	2.5	1.1	1.9	.3	2.5	.0
	News St Aft	6.3	.0	.6	.8	24.6	.9	.9	2.8	2.8	1.7	4.6	2.1	2.8	2.1	7.4	.0
	Editorials Bef	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Editorials Aft	.0	.0	13.8	1.7	20.7	.0	.0	5.2	3.4	.0	5.2	.0	13.8	.0	22.4	.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.6</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>.0</b>

## VITA

### MARÍA J. PESTALARDO

- Personal Data: Date of Birth: June 29, 1978  
Place of Birth: Bahía Blanca, Argentina  
Marital Status: Single
- Education: Ateneo de Estudios Terciarios, Buenos Aires, Argentina;  
Ceremonial and Protocol, B.A., 1999  
Ateneo de Estudios Terciarios, Buenos Aires, Argentina;  
Public Relations, B.A., 1999  
Universidad J.F. Kennedy, Buenos Aires, Argentina;  
Strategic Communications, B.A., 2003  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN;  
Professional Communications, M.A., 2006
- Professional Experience: Migrant Education Program Coordinator, East Tennessee State University; Johnson City, Tennessee, 2004-2006  
El Nuevo Spanish editor, East Tennessee State University; Johnson City, Tennessee, 2004-2006  
Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University, Foreign Languages Department; Johnson City, Tennessee, 2004-2006  
Advisor of the Spokesperson of the President of Argentina, Dr. Nestor Kirchner, Pink House; Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2003-2004  
Account Executive -Fleishman Hillard International Communications, Argentina-Uruguay; Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1999-2003.  
Sales Manager, Martha Olmos Buenos Aires; Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1996-2000:
- Publications: Pestalardo, María J.(2006). Media Framing: The War in Iraq, IABD Business Research Yearbook, Morgan State University, Baltimore, pp 438-442.  
  
Pestalardo, María J.(2003). "Environment: from Ecology to business." Universidad JF Kennedy. Buenos Aires. UJFK Publicaciones.
- Honors: Sigma Delta Phi Honor Society